

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

JAN 27 2003

TENTH CIRCUIT

PATRICK FISHER
Clerk

WILLIAM LORD PUNCHARD, King,
Royal Democratic State of Continental
Africa Government (Edmund Right,
Royal Consul; Michel Contreres,
Royal Consul),

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

STATE OF NEW MEXICO; GARRY
JOHNSON, Governor; 2ND
JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF
NEW MEXICO; 12TH JUDICIAL
DISTRICT COURT OF NEW
MEXICO; NEW MEXICO STATE
CORRECTIONS DEPARTMENT;
DEMING CITY MAGISTRATE
COURT,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 02-2275
D.C. No. CIV-02-780 BB/KBM
(D. New Mexico)

ORDER AND JUDGMENT*

Before **KELLY, McKAY**, and **MURPHY**, Circuit Judges.

*This order and judgment is not binding precedent, except under the doctrines of law of the case, res judicata and collateral estoppel. The court generally disfavors the citation of orders and judgments; nevertheless, an order and judgment may be cited under the terms and conditions of 10th Cir. R. 36.3.

After examining the briefs and appellate record, this panel has determined unanimously that oral argument would not materially assist the determination of this appeal. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2); 10th Cir. R. 34.1(G). The case is therefore ordered submitted without oral argument.

William Punchard, proceeding *pro se*, appeals the district court's dismissal of his action for lack of federal jurisdiction. In his filings before the district court, Punchard alleged that he is the head-of-state of a non-existent country and that two diplomats employed by his "country" are being illegally incarcerated in New Mexico state prison; Punchard requested habeas relief on behalf of these two individuals. Punchard further alleged that he was being harassed by the Deming, New Mexico "City Magistrate Court," which is allegedly mailing "Harassing Court Summons" to his "Royal Embassy." In dismissing this action, the district court concluded that Punchard's allegations were so fanciful and delusional that they failed to invoke the court's federal question jurisdiction.

This court has thoroughly reviewed all of the numerous documents filed by Punchard in this appeal and has reviewed *de novo* the district court's order of dismissal and the entire record on appeal. That review demonstrates that the district court's resolution of the case was substantially correct. Accordingly, this

court **AFFIRMS** for substantially those reasons set out in the district court's order of dismissal dated September 3, 2002. All pending motions are hereby **DENIED.**

ENTERED FOR THE COURT

PER CURIAM